DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 235 FL 019 885

AUTHOR Cohen, Andrew D.
TITLE The Role of Instructions in Testing Summarizing Ability.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Language Testing Research Colloquium (12th, San Francisco, CA, March 3-5, 1990). For an earlier report of this study, see ED 308 691.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Guidelines; Higher Education; *Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Language Tests; *Reading Comprehension; *Second Language Learning; Test Results; Translation; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Israel; *Summarization

ABSTRACT

The effects of specific guidelines in the taking and rating of tests of language summarizing ability were investigated, as well as interrater agreement regarding the rating of specific ideas within the summaries. The tests involved respondents reading source texts and providing written summaries as a measure of their reading comprehension and writing abilities. The subjects of the study were 63 native-Hebrew-speaking students from the Seminar Hakibbuttzim Teacher Training College in Tel Aviv. Twenty-six subjects were from two high-proficiency English-foreign-language (EFL) classes and 37 were from 2 intermediate EFL classes. Five texts were used in the study: two texts in Hebrew and three in English. Two sets of instructions were developed: one "guided" version with specific instructions on how to read the texts and how to write the summaries, and the other with the typical "minimal" instructions. Scoring keys for the texts were based on the summaries of nine Hebrew-speaking and nine English-speaking experts. The study demonstrated that whereas the guided instructions had a mixed effect on the summarizing of native-language texts, they had a somewhat positive effect on summarizing of foreign-language texts. In some cases, the guided instructions helped respondents find key elements to summarize, but in other cases they apparently dissuaded the respondent from including important details. Certain ideas seemed to be susceptible to rater disagreement more than others. The guidelines and English texts are appended. Contains 23 references. (Author/LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341235

THE ROLE OF INSTRUCTIONS IN TESTING SUMMARIZING ABILITY[1]

Andrew D. Cohen

School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
and, as of 9/92, Program in ESL, University of Minnesota

October 1990

---

[1]Paper prepared for presentation at the 12th Annual Language Testing Research Colloquium, San Francisco, 3-5 March, 1990. I wish to acknowledge Elana Shohamy for her assistance in the design of this study and Rachel Segev for her help in collecting the data. I would also like to acknowledge Don Porter, Gissi Sarig, and Iris Geva for their constructive comments regarding the study. In addition, I wish to thank the eighteen informants who graciously consented to provide expert summaries of the texts.

To appear in D. Douglas & C. Chapelle (eds.), A new decade of language testing: Collaboration and cooperation. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cohen Andrew

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 019 885

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to determine the effects of specific guidelines in the taking and the rating of tests of summarizing ability -- tests in which respondents read source texts and provide written summaries as a measure of their reading comprehension level as well as of their writing ability. The study also looked at interrater agreement regarding the rating of specific ideas within the summaries.

The subjects for this study were 63 native-Hebrew-speaking students from the Seminar Hakibbutzim Teacher Training College in Tel Aviv. Twenty-six were from two high-proficiency English-foreign-language (EFL) classes and 37 were from two intermediate EFL classes. Four raters assessed the students' summaries in the study. The two who rated the Hebrew summaries of the Hebrew texts were both native Hebrew speakers. Of the two rating the Hebrew summaries of the EFL texts, one was a native Hebrew speaker and the other an English speaker. Five texts were selected for the study, two in Hebrew and three in English (each intermediate and advanced EFL student being asked to summarize two). Two sets of instructions were developed. One version was "guided" with specific instructions on how to read the texts and how to write the summaries. The other version had the typical "minimal" instructions. The scoring keys for the texts were based on the summaries of nine Hebrew-speaking and nine English-speaking experts respectively. All 63 respondents summarized the first Hebrew text, 53 summarized the second Hebrew text, and on the average, slightly more than a third of the students wrote summaries for the EFL texts.

The study demonstrated that whereas the guided instructions had a mixed effects on the summarizing of native-language texts, they had a somewhat positive effect on summarizing of foreign-language texts. An analysis of the summaries on an idea-by-idea basis actually revealed that the guided instructions seemed both helpful and detrimental in summarizing of texts. In some cases, they assisted respondents in finding the key elements to summarize, and in other cases they probably dissuaded the respondent from including details that in fact proved to be essential in the eyes of the experts upon whom the rating key was based. A close-order investigation of consistency across raters on an idea-by-idea basis revealed that certain ideas (e.g., certain global ideas, as well as matters of detail) seemed to be susceptible to disagreement more than others.

Introduction

In order to summarize successfully, respondents need both reading and writing skills. First, they must select and utilize effectively those reading strategies appropriate for summarizing the source text -- i.e., identifying topical information, distinguishing superordinate from subordinate material, and identifying redundant as well as trivial information. Then they must perform the appropriate writing tasks to produce a coherent text summary -- i.e., selecting topical information or generating it if none appears explicitly in the text, deleting trivial and redundant material, substituting superordinate terms for lists of terms or sequences of events, and finally, restating the text so that it sounds coherent and polishing it so that it reads smoothly (Kintsch & van Dijk 1978, van Dijk 1980, Brown, Campione, & Day 1981, Brown & Day 1983, Chou Hare & Borchardt 1984, Basham & Rounds 1986, Davies & Whitney 1984).

Summarizing tasks on reading comprehension tests have a natural appeal as "authentic" tests in this era of communicative language testing, given the fact that they attempt to simulate real-world tasks in which nonnative readers are actually called upon to read and write a summary of the main ideas of a text. The results are intended to reflect how the respondents might actually perform on such a task. In fact, a real-world summary is often quite different from a test summary. Real summaries are usually prepared for others who have not read the text and simply want to know what it is about. Such readers would probably not be fussy about the form in which the summary appears. Test summaries, on the other hand, usually have restrictions as to length, format, and style, and are prepared for an assessor who has already decided what the text is about and wants to see to what extent the respondents approximate these prior decisions.

Thus, the test summary may result in a mismatch whereby respondents use one set of criteria in preparing their summaries, while the raters use another in assessing them. For example, there are undoubtedly differences of perception regarding what a "main idea" consists of and the appropriate way to write it up (e.g., precisely how telegraphically). There may also be differing views as to the acceptability of introducing commentary into the summary. Research by Basham (1987) with Alaska Native students showed that these respondents used their own world view as a filter in the summaries that they wrote, personalizing them. If such differences are not eliminated through prior training and/or through careful instructions on the test, there could be a misfit between the way the summary task is executed and the criteria used by the raters to evaluate it.

Along with possible cultural differences, there are other potential causes of discrepancy between the way respondents are "supposed" to prepare summaries and the way they actually do it. For example, a study of 40 Hebrew-speaking university students writing EFL summaries found that while the notes they took on the text were of a word-level, "bottom-up" nature, their summaries were found to be conducted on a top-down basis -- i.e., general knowledge. The conclusion drawn by the researchers was that the reading was fragmented rather than reflecting ongoing interaction with the text that would combine top-down and bottom-up analysis (Kozminsky & Graetz 1986). Likewise, a recent survey of

Brazilian studies of reading processes (Cohen 1987) indicated that the respondents involved were often not executing summarizing tasks in a way consistent with the model of what summarizing should entail, as presented above. A study by Holmes (1986), for example, found that the six EFL graduate students did little monitoring of their summaries. They read in a linear and compartmentalized manner, rather than globally so as to extract the main ideas.

Consistent with Holmes' study, a study by Gimenez (1984) with five EFL graduate students revealed the major summarizing strategy to be that of word-level processing, as opposed to syntactic analysis or text-level analysis. Often the summaries were found to reflect a focus on only part of the text, with the interpretation of the text based on the words that the subject had learned (however effectively) and collected up in reading the text and on previous knowledge.

In a study comparing a group of high-proficiency college-level EFL students with a low-proficiency group, Johns and Mayes (in press) found neither group to be using macro-propositions[2] in their summaries. Furthermore, the low students were found to be doing a considerable amount of direct copying of material from the source text into their summaries, as it was required that the summaries be written in the second language as well. In an earlier study, Johns (1985) had found that underprepared natives were likewise more prone to use reproductions (copying and paraphrase) in their summaries than macro-propositions. In a case study, Sarig (1988) helped explain the propensity to lift material directly out of the text for use in summaries. She found conceptual transformation or reconceptualization at the macro-level to be a skill that did not come naturally either in native or foreign-language summarizing for a competent college student. She concluded that it had to be taught explicitly. Nonetheless, the explicit teaching of such reconceptualization may not yield such positive results either. Bensoussan and Kreindler (1990), for example, found that whereas EFL students with a semester's training in summary writing now saw summaries as an important tool for grasping the gist of a text, they still expressed frustration at their inability to distinguish macro- from micro-propositions.

A previous study by this investigator (Cohen, in press) had as its main purpose to investigate the ways in which respondents at different proficiency levels carry out summarizing tasks on a reading comprehension test. The respondents for that study were five native Portuguese speakers who had all recently completed a course in English for Academic Purposes (at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de S•o Paulo, Brazil) with an emphasis on reading strategies, including summarizing. They represented three proficiency levels.

The findings showed that the respondents in that study had little difficulty identifying topical information, yet they had difficulty in distinguishing superordinate, non-redundant material from the rest, due in large part to an insufficient grasp of foreign-language vocabulary. For their written summaries, they did not need to generate topic information

---

[2]Higher-level or superordinate idea units or statements.

because all the texts provided it. They did not, however, have a good sense of balance with respect to how much to delete. Either they were too vague and general or too detailed. While there was some concern for coherence production, there appeared to be relatively little attention paid to producing thoroughly coherent and polished summaries. In essence, the respondents in the study appeared to be more concerned about their interpretation of the source text than they are about their production of a summary.

Aside from problems that the respondents have in preparing summaries of texts on tests, there is the further problem as to the reliability of the ratings of these summaries. It has been found, for instance, that the statistical results from summarizing tasks are not always consistent with results from other types of tests (e.g., multiple-choice, short-answer, and cloze). Shohamy, for example, set out to compare tests of summarizing English-foreign-language (EFL) texts to tests with a multiple-choice and an open-ended response format -- with responses either in native language or foreign language, depending on the test version. She found the results from the summarizing data so inconsistent with the results on the other subtests that she eliminated the findings from the published study (Shohamy, Personal Communication, and Shohamy 1984).[3]

The author's previous study (Cohen, in press) also investigated how raters dealt with the responses of the five participating students. Two EAP course instructors who typically rated the EAP exams of summarizing skill at that institution also participated in the study as raters. It was found that there were some inconsistencies in the raters' behaviors, underscoring the importance of developing rigorous rating keys with main ideas and connecting schemata for each text.

One main purpose of the present study was to determine the effects of specific guidelines in the taking of tests of summarizing ability. Tests of summarization do not usually include specific, guided instructions for the respondents as to how to construct their summary. Previous research on test-taking strategies would suggest that instructions on tests may not even be read if they are heeded to at all (e.g., Cohen 1984). The intention in this study was to build into the test a set of instructions that would serve as a genuine guide for the respondent. It had been the experience of the investigator and of colleagues that test instructions were often notoriously vague and that they presupposed an understanding of how to do the task -- especially in the case of an activity as complex as summarizing. Although it may be thought that respondents would draw upon previous knowledge (e.g., from classroom instruction) as to how to summarize, it would appear that they do not necessarily exercise this knowledge when in a testing situation.

The other purpose of the study was to investigate the rating of such tests of summarizing when a rigorous, empirically-derived scoring key was provided, since the absence of such guidelines

---

[3] It is also possible that Shohamy's summarization subtest was measuring some aspects of reading that the other subtests were not -- e.g., a more overall view of the text. But it was also probably measuring writing skill, as well as reflecting possible lack of reliability in the ratings.

was seen as contributing to a lack of reliability in the ratings of summaries. The study took a look at the consistency across raters on an idea-by-idea basis in order to determine causes for disagreement in ratings.

The study asked the following questions:

1. In what ways do guided instructions affect performance on a summary task?
2. How consistent are the ratings of the summaries across raters?

Design of the Study

Subjects

The Respondents: The subjects for this study were 63 native-Hebrew-speaking students from the Seminar Hakibbutzim Teacher Training College in Tel Aviv. Twenty-six were from two high-proficiency English-foreign-language (EFL) classes and 37 were from two intermediate EFL classes.

The Raters: Four raters assessed the students' summaries in the study. The two who rated the Hebrew summaries of the Hebrew texts were both native Hebrew-speaking undergraduates in their last year at the Hebrew University. Of the two rating the Hebrew summaries of the EFL texts, one was a native-Hebrew-speaking freshman at the Hebrew University and the other an English speaker doing a graduate degree at Tel-Aviv University. The latter was highly proficient in Hebrew, as she had received twelve years of schooling at a Hebrew day school in the U.S., was married to an Israeli, and had lived in Israel for five years.

Instruments

The Texts: Five texts were selected for the study, two in Hebrew and three in English. The two Hebrew texts were intended to reflect two levels of difficulty -- both in terms of content, complexity of language, and summarizability (i.e., how easy they appeared to summarize). The first Hebrew text (800 words) was entitled, "Movies -- from a Form of Magic to an Art Form." It was divided into five sections, each containing a subtitle, thus making it "summarizer-friendly." The second text (1,200 words) was entitled, "Problems with New Israeli Prose -- Between Separatism and Integration." This text was written in a more problematic style, and a successful summary of the text required a certain degree of background knowledge about the topic.

Three EFL texts were selected so as to represent three levels of difficulty. The easiest (1,000 words), entitled "How to Avoid Foolish Opinions," presented a series of procedures for avoiding such opinions. Its clear organization facilitated summarizing. The second text (1,200 words), entitled "Modern Constitutions," was more complex both in language and in its conceptual organization. The third article (850 words), entitled "Specialization," was intended to be the most difficult article, but actually turned out to have a relatively easy structure for purposes of summary.

Instructions for Summarizing: Two sets of instructions

were developed. One version was "guided" with specific instructions on how to read the texts and how to write the summaries. The other version had the typical "minimal" instructions. The guided instructions told the respondents to read each text in order to identify the most important points -- those that contained the key sentences in each paragraph or those that would make the summary interesting to read. The respondents were then instructed to write the summary such that the content would be reduced to only the essential points and that less important details or those detracting from the main points would be eliminated. They were also requested to write briefly -- e.g., 80-120 words per summary.[4] Their text was to comprise one paragraph with all the ideas linked by connecting words. They were requested to write the summaries in their own words, and in the case of Hebrew summaries of EFL texts, not to translate word for word. They were also asked to write a draft first and then to copy it over legibly (see Appendix A).

The more traditional, non-guided instructions simply told the respondents to read each text so as to be able to write a summary of it. They were asked to be brief -- 80-120-word summaries, to write their summary first in draft form and then to copy it over legibly.

Construction of Rating Keys: The two Hebrew texts were read and summarized by nine Hebrew speakers, all experts in the areas of reading and writing. Three were university lecturers, specializing in discourse. The rest were university students of language arts and teachers in their own right. The three EFL texts were read and summarized in English by nine native English-speakers, most of whom were university instructors of EFL. The summaries of these experts were analyzed and a key was constructed to include only those main ideas and linking ideas that a majority (i.e., five or more) of the experts had included in their summaries (after Sarig 1989). In this study, no effort was made to distinguish the macro- from the micro-propositions in the scoring key.

The key for the Hebrew texts was produced by one of the two raters. The key for the EFL texts was produced by the investigator and then translated into Hebrew by the Hebrew-speaking rater of the EFL texts, whose English skills were also quite advanced. The EFL key was translated into Hebrew. The keys appeared in the form of a list of numbered ideas, each in sentence form. Table 1 shows the level of agreement for each point selected per passage.

The summaries of the Hebrew experts reflected an 80% average agreement as to which main ideas and connecting ideas should be included in the summary. The summaries of the EFL experts reflected an 85% average agreement as to which ideas to include. Hence, it should be noted that there was not full agreement even among experts as to which ideas were essential to the construction of a meaningful summary.

---

[4]The stipulation of number of words is based on common practice in the United States. In Israel, students are used to being told to write a paragraph or a page (a less precise measure).

Data Collection Procedures

The students were requested to write the summaries in two meetings of their EFL course -- the first one for the Hebrew texts, the second one for the English texts. The sessions took place in December, 1988, and were one week apart. Each lasted approximately 1½ hours. The task with guided instructions was administered to every other student according to how they were seated in a given classroom. The other students received the unguided version. All students received in the second sitting the same type of instructions as they had received in the first, as this time their name was written on the instruction sheet in advance. The tasks were not presented as obligatory and were not to count towards the students' grade in the course.

All 63 respondents summarized the first Hebrew text, 32 receiving guided instructions and 31 not. Fifty-three respondents summarized the second Hebrew text, 27 receiving instructions and 26 not. On the average, only a little more than a third of the students wrote summaries for the EFL texts. A breakdown of the numbers of respondents for each text according to version (guided vs. unguided) and respondents' level of proficiency (intermediate vs. advanced) appears in Table 2. The 15% of the students who chose not to summarize the second Hebrew text and the 65% who chose not to summarize the EFL texts did so primarily because they found those texts too difficult to summarize.

Although the instructions for both the guided and unguided versions specified that the students were to write a draft summary and then copy it over neatly, only seven of the 67 students did this for the Hebrew summaries, four of the intermediate students and three of the advanced ones. As for the summaries of the EFL texts, only one advanced student wrote a draft, as that student had done for the Hebrew texts as well. Thus, this element in the instructions was not followed in either of the two versions.

Data Analysis Procedures

The raters received brief training by the investigator in rating the summaries and then did several of the ratings in the presence of the investigator in order to resolve problems of immediate concern. The raters were also asked to make note of problems to be resolved in consultation with the investigator after completing the ratings. Each main idea and linking idea received one point in the rating process. No effort was made to have the pairs of raters of the Hebrew and EFL texts "conference" together while learning how to do the ratings. However, ratings of the two pairs of raters for the Hebrew and EFL texts were correlated to determine interrater reliability and discrepancies were identified on a point by point basis in order to determine the types of ideas for which raters had difficulty reaching consensus.

Crosstabulations were run using the SPSS-PC program to check for differences in success at summarizing between the respondents given the guided and unguided versions. The Correlations program was run to determine interrater reliability.

Findings

1. The Effect of Guided Instructions on Summarizing

a. The Summaries of Hebrew Texts: Guided instructions seemed to have a mixed, or even negative effect on the summarizing of native-language texts. On the first Hebrew text, the one on movies, the second rater rated the **unguided** group significantly better overall than the group with guided instructions. Yet when behavior was examined at the idea-by-idea level, some interesting differences emerged suggesting that the provision of guided instructions has a differential effect on summarizing, perhaps helping in some instances and interfering in others. In examining the main ideas within that Movie text, item #5 was one for which the unguided group were rated significantly better by both raters (see Table 3). This idea involved giving details as to why movies are an art form (e.g., they deal with shape, color, movement, words, and music). It is likely that those getting the instructions warning them not to include unnecessary details were reluctant to provide this level of detail for fear that it would be rated as extraneous.

On the second Hebrew text there were two significant differences by version, one favoring the guided and one favoring the unguided instructions. In the first instance, the guided group which was told to identify all the main ideas in the key sentences included idea #6 more than did the unguided group. This idea consisted of the second of two examples of "separatism and then reintegration in Israeli prose." In other words, the guided group was more sensitive to including both of the examples. In the second instance, the unguided group was more likely to include in their summary a linking statement to the effect that new Israeli prose is characterized by continuity in the midst of apparent separatism (see Table 3). In this case, it was the guided group that was reminded of the importance of linking up ideas and yet the unguided group practiced it more successfully in this case.

b. The Summaries of EFL Texts: In the EFL text summaries, there were two instances of significant difference by version, according to the first rater, both in favor of the guided group. The **guided** group were more likely to include the first idea in the summary of the Modern Constitutions text -- namely, the idea which provides an historical perspective for the passage. In addition, they were also more likely to include the detail that countries differ as to the number of special checks and balances stipulated by their constitution (see Table 4). Hence, with respect to native-language summaries of foreign-language texts, the group given the fuller instructions seemed more sensitive to include the introductory idea as well as to include detail that might not be deemed central to the summary.

2. The Consistency of Ratings Across Raters

a. The Raters of the Hebrew Texts: The average correlation of the ratings of the two Hebrew native speakers across the two texts that they rated, was significant but relatively low as a reliability coefficient ($r = .73$, $p<.001$). On the Movie text, there was significant agreement on five of the

points, four involving basic description and one involving basic exemplification (i.e., what makes movies an art form) (Table 5). There was inconsistency on three points, two involving contrast (both involving the contrast between then and now) and one involving detailed exemplification (i.e., regarding modern technology in moving making).

On the New Israeli Prose text, there was considerable agreement involving the opening contrastive idea (i.e., separatism and integration), two examples of this, and a linking idea (i.e., dealing with the continuity in Israeli prose) (Table 5). There was some agreement concerning a descriptive point regarding the origins of separatism, and less agreement regarding two other descriptive points -- a point about continuity and a point introducing the two examples of separatism and integration.

b. The Raters of the EFL Texts: The average correlation of the two raters across the three EFL texts was high ($r = .85$, $p<.001$), especially considering that the first was a native Hebrew speaker and the second a native English speaker. Yet when we look at the level of consistency from idea to idea within the three EFL texts, we note that there are marked differences (Table 6). On the Opinions text, the raters agreed on their ratings of the fifth and sixth ideas, and more or less so on the third idea, but not for the first or opening statement (i.e., the article suggests procedures for avoiding foolish opinions), the second, or the fourth (an extension of the second suggestion).

On the second text, the raters agreed on the opening statement which gives an historical perspective and on three of the basic points (i.e., a justification for constitutions being above law, protection of special communities, constitutions of countries differ), but disagreed on the topic sentence linking the passage together cohesively (in terms of the constitution as a fresh start) and on an item dealing with details of what rights a constitution includes. On the third text, the raters agreed on all but the opening idea (i.e., that by the end of the nineteenth century the intellectual generalists had given way to specialists)(Table 6).

Thus, the raters were inconsistent in their ratings of several of the more global, linking ideas and of ideas involving details in the EFL texts. These discrepancies would not appear to be the result of native language differences. Instead, it would seem that these are perhaps the ideas that lend themselves to the most controversy in rating, even when a precise key is provided. This study did not attempt to investigate why raters disagreed on their assessments of respondents' answers as conducted in a previous study (Cohen, in press), but the findings would indicate that certain ideas on a rating key are problematic for scoring and others are not, and that the language of the rater may not be as important here as other factors.

Discussion and Conclusions

The current study demonstrated that whereas guided instructions had a mixed effect on summarizing of native-language texts, they had a somewhat positive effect on summarizing of foreign-language texts. An analysis of summaries on an item-by-item basis revealed that, in reality, the guided instructions

appeared to be both helpful and detrimental. In some cases, they assisted respondents in finding the key elements to summarize, and in other cases they probably dissuaded the respondent from including details that in fact proved to be essential in the eyes of the experts upon whom the rating key was based.

Since all the students were admonished to read the instructions carefully, it is likely that they did so and that the results do reflect the two conditions for test taking -- with and without guided instructions. The results, then, would suggest that the nature of the instructions in foreign-language testing may be of more importance than in native-language testing. In other words, test constructors may wish to give more explicit guidance to nonnatives concerning recommended means for carrying out the given task than they would give to natives. With regard to native-language testing tasks, it is likely that the respondents may either pay less attention to the instructions altogether or may simply exercise appropriate test-taking strategies without needing a reminder as to how to do it.

With respect to interrater consistency, it was found that the raters differed in their ratings both of several of the more macro-level, global, linking ideas, as well as of micro-level ideas involving details in the EFL texts. It would appear that certain ideas at these two disparate levels lend themselves to controversy in rating, even when a precise key is provided.

Limitations in the current study can also be seen as recommendations for future research:

(1) Although the intention was to indicate for each summary who the text was being summarized for, this was inadvertently left out of the instructions for both groups. If we take the EFL text on Specialization, for example, it was intended that the respondents would be told, say, that they work for a company that makes documentary movies and that their boss has asked them to read an article on the dangers of overspecialization and to summarize it for him in order that they may get some ideas for the preparation of the script for the documentary. Perhaps the addition of this modicum of functionality would have prompted more of the students to do the task in a context where participation was not obligatory.

(2) It may have been beneficial to the research to have the summaries count for course credit. Then perhaps more of the students would made an effort to summarize the second Hebrew text and the two EFL texts that they were assigned. The fact is that the respondents probably did not have behaved on these tasks as they would on a genuine test.

(3) The first rater of the Hebrew texts had an observation regarding the scoring key. She felt that by using a key based on the judgment of "experts," it was skewing the assessment away from the level of the students who were being assessed. She felt that the experts wrote a different type of summary from the seminar students -- i.e., that they used more of a logical sequence in the presentation of their ideas, demonstrated a tighter use of words, and displayed greater overall quality in their writing. Besides for these observations, she noted that whereas there were points that the experts did not agree upon and were thus left out of the key, nonetheless students felt these points to be important enough to include. A compromise would be to build a rating key based both on the suggestions of the

respondents as to key ideas and the insights of the examiners, as was done by Bensoussan and Kreindler (1990).

In the work by Bensoussan and Kreindler, as soon as the respondents finished summarizing the given texts, they were presented with the two teachers' set of main ideas for the summary arrived at through conferencing, and were asked as a group to react to that set. If they disagreed with any of the teachers' points, they had to convince the teachers that a change was in order in the scoring key. Apparently the students became more proficient at this task as they performed it various times. While at the beginning of the course the teachers dictated the correct summaries, by the end of the semester, the students had learned how to suggest changes (Bensoussan, Personal Communication).

(4) No test-taking data were collected in this study as had been collected using verbal report techniques in studies reported on elsewhere (e.g., Cohen 1984, in press). Hence, there was no assurance, for example, that the students taking the guided version had paid full attention to the elaborated instructions that they received. It was impossible to read those instructions aloud since every other student received the unguided instructions. Perhaps a future study would collect data regarding the processing of the instructions.

(5) The raters did not conference with each other concerning the appropriate ratings for each summary. A follow-up study would include rater conferencing with other raters, say in pairs, in order to allow for potentially greater consistency across raters. Such conferencing could also be studied at the process level through analysis of verbal reports in order to determine what such conferencing entails.

(6) More global ideas were not given more credit in the summaries than more local ideas. Future work could distinguish main ideas at the level of micro- and macro-propositions to see the extent to which the level of abstraction of the proposition influences the behavior of the rater.

Table 1

Level of Agreement for Points Selected for Key

Hebrew Texts: "Movies -- from a Form of Magic to an Art Form"
1. 9/9 2. 6/9 3. 7/9 4. 6/9 5. 5/9 6. 6/9 7. 8/9 8. 7/9

"Problems with New Israeli Prose -- Between Separatism and Integration"
1. 8/9 2. 7/9 3. 7/9 4. 6/9 5. 9/9 6. 9/9 7. 8/9

"How to Avoid Foolish Opinions"
1. 8/9 2. 8/9 3. 7/9 4. 9/9 5. 9/9 6. 8/9 7. 8/9

"Modern Constitutions"
1. 8/9 2. 9/9 3. 6/9 4. 8/9 5. 7/9 6. 5/9 7. 8/9

"Specialization"
1. 7/9 2. 5/9 3. 9/9 4. 9/9

Table 2
Respondents for Text Summaries

	Guided Version			Unguided Version			Overall
EFL Level:	Int.	Adv.	Total	Int.	Adv.	Total	
Hebrew Texts:							
Movies as an Art Form	19	13	32	18	13	31	63
New Israeli Prose	16	11	27	17	9	26	53
EFL Texts:							
Foolish Opinions	12	-	12	5	-	5	17
Modern Constitution	8	3	11	4	7	11	22
Specialization	-	3	3	-	4	7	10

Table 3

Summaries of Hebrew Texts by Version
(with/without Guided Instructions)

	Rater 2 - Total Perf. Version		Rater 1 - Idea 5 (Details) Version			Rater 2 - Idea 5 (Details) Version		
	Points	Guided	Unguided	Pts.	Guided	Ung.	Pts.	Guided	Ung.
	0	-	-	0	26	15	0	28	18
Movies	2	4	1	1	6	16	1	4	13
as	3	13	2						
Art Form	4	8	18						
Text	5	4	7						
in	6	2	1						
Hebrew	7	1	2						
	N = 32		31						
	d.f. 5			d.f. 1			d.f. 1		
	Chi-Square=15.19**			Chi-Square=7.48**			Chi-Square=6.92**		

	Rater 1 - Idea 6 (Second Example) Version			Rater 2 - Idea 7 (Linking Idea) Version		
	Pts.	Guided	Ung.	Pts.	Guided	Ung.
New	0	7	14	0	15	7
Israeli	1	20	12	1	12	19
Prose						
Text	N = 27		26			
in	d.f. 1			d.f. 1		
Hebrew	Chi-Square=4.32*			Chi-Square=4.47*		

Table 4

Summaries of EFL Texts by Version
(with/without Guided Instructions)

	Rater 1 - Idea 1 (Perspective) Version			Rater 1 - Idea 6 (Detail) Version		
	Pts.	Guided	Ung.	Pts.	Guided	Ung.
Modern	0	0	5	0	6	10
Consti-	1	11	6	1	5	1
tution						
Text	N =	11	11			
in	d.f. 1			d.f. 1		
EFL	Chi-Square=6.47**			Chi-Square=3.67*		

** p<.01
* p<.05

Table 5

Interrater Agreement on the Hebrew Texts

	Idea: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Overall
	De-scription	Descr.	Con-trast	Descr. Exempli-fication	Basic Descr.		De-tailed Exemplif.	Con-trast	
Movie Text	.55***	.84***	.23	.59***	.83***	.57***	.10	.20	.34*

N=63

	Idea: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Overall
	Contrast	De-scription	Descr.	Descr. Exemp-lification	Exemp.		Link	
Prose Text	.60**	.45**	.04	.06	.89***	.88***	.65***	.81***

N=53

Average correlation of ratings across both texts = .73*** (N=53)

Table 6

Interrater Agreement on the EFL Texts

	Idea: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Overall
	Purpose for Article	1st Sugges-tion	2nd Sug.	Ext. of 2nd Sug.	3rd Sug.	4th Sug.		
Opin-ions Text	.19	.04	.45	-.09	.54*	.75***	--	.56*

N=16

	Idea: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Overall
	Perspec-tive		Justi-fication	De-tails	Descrip-tion	Descr.	Link	
Consti-tution Text	.59**	--	.47	.20	.91**	.46	-.05	.62**

N=22

	Idea: 1	2	3	4	Overall
	Opener	General Ignorance	Ignor. in Field	Result of Mechanization	
Special-ization Text	.17	1.00**	.47	.73	.94***

N=7

Average correlation of ratings across all three texts = .85*** (N=27)

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001

REFERENCES CITED

Basham, C.S. 1987. Summary writing as cultural artifact. Fairbanks, Alaska: Cross-Cultural Communications, University of Alaska.

Basham, C.S. & Rounds, P.L. 1986. A discourse analysis approach to summary writing. Papers in Applied Linguistics - Michigan, 1 (2), 88-104.

Bensoussan, M. & Kreindler, I. 1990. Improving advanced reading comprehension in a foreign language: Summaries vs. short-answer questions. Journal of Research in Reading, 13 (1), 55-68.

Brown, A.L., Campione, J.C., & Day, J.D. 1981. Learning to learn: On training students to learn from text. Educational Researcher, 10, 14-21.

Brown, A.L. & Day, J.D. 1983. Macrorules for summarizing texts: The development of expertise. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 22, 1-14.

Chou Hare, V. & Borchardt, K.M. 1984. Direct instruction of summarization skills. Reading Research Quarterly, 20 (1), 62-78.

Cohen, A.D. 1984. On taking language tests: What the students report. Language Testing, 1 (1), 70-81.

Cohen, A.D. 1987. Research on cognitive processing in reading in Brazil. D.E.L.T.A., 3 (2), 215-235. (Depto. de Linguística, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de S•o Paulo)

Cohen, A.D. In press. English testing in Brazil: Problems in using summary tasks. In C. Hill & K. Parry (Eds.), The test at the gate: Ethnographic perspectives on the assessment of English literacy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Davies, E. & Whitney, N. 1984. "Study skill 11: Writing summaries," in Study skills for reading: Students' book. London: Heinemann, 56-58.

Gimenez, R.N. 1984. Legibilidade de textos acadßmicos em ingles da area de servi∂o social. M.A. thesis, Graduate Program in Applied Linguistics, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de S•o Paulo.

Hidi, S. & Anderson, V. 1986. Producing written summaries: task demands, cognitive operations, and implications for instruction. Review of Educational Research, 56 (4), 473-493.

Holmes, J.L. 1986. Snarks, quarks and cognates: An elusive fundamental particle in reading comprehension. The ESPecialist, 15, 13-40 (Centro de Pesquisas, Recursos e Informa∂•o em Leitura, Pontí- fícia Universidade Católica de S•o Paulo).

Johns, A.M. 1985. Summary protocols of "underprepared" and "adept" university students: Replications and distortions of the original. Language Learning, 35 (4), 495-517.

Johns, A.M. & Mayes, P. In press. An analysis of summary protocols of university ESL students. Applied Linguistics.

Kintsch, W. & van Dijk, T.A. 1978. Toward a model of text comprehension and production. Psychological Review, 85 (5), 363-394.

Kozminsky, E. & Graetz, N. 1986. First vs. second language comprehension: Some evidence from text summarizing. Journal of Reading Research, 9, 3-21.

Sarig, G. 1987. High-level reading tasks in the first and in a foreign language: Some comparative process data. In J. Devine, P.L. Carrell, & D.E. Eskey (Eds.), Research in reading in

English as a second language. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 105-120.

Sarig, G. 1988. Composing a study-summary: A reading-writing encounter. Ramat Aviv, Israel: Open University.

Sarig, G. 1989. Testing meaning construction: Can we do it fairly? Language Testing, 6(1), 77-94.

Sarig, G. & Folman, S. 1987. Metacognitive awareness and theoretical knowledge in coherence prediction. Ramat-Aviv, Israel: Everyman's University.

Shohamy, E. 1984. Does the testing method make a difference? The case of reading comprehension. Language Testing, 1 (2), 147-170.

van Dijk, R.A. 1980. Macrostructures. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix A

Translation of the Elaborated Instructions:

Reading Text and Writing a Summary of the Text

Before you are four texts, two in Hebrew and two in English.

Instructions for Reading

Read each text so as to extract the most important points from it, that is, those points that contain the key sentences (for the given paragraph); or those points that the reader of the summary will be interested in reading.

Instructions for Writing the Summary (in Hebrew)

1. Reduce the information to main points only: avoid the inclusion of redundant information. Including this information will detract from your score.
2. Write briefly: the length of the summary is to be 80 words for the first passage and 120 words for the second.
3. Write the summary as a single passage: use connecting words to link the points together.
4. Do not translate literally: write the summary in your own words.
5. Write a draft first, and then copy it over legibly.

Translation of the Traditional Brief Instructions:

Reading the Text and Writing a Summary of It

Before you are four texts, two in Hebrew and two in English. You are to read each one so as to write a summary of it.

Instructions for Writing the Summary (in Hebrew)

1. Write briefly: the length of the summary is to be 80 words for the first passage and 120 words for the second.
2. Write a draft first, and then copy it over legibly.

APPENDIX B

English Translation of Hebrew Texts and Scoring Keys

MOVIES -- FROM A FORM OF MAGIC TO AN ART FORM

by Lea Dovev-Rosenbaum

Films as a Form of Magic

The first movie makers and viewers did not see movies as an art form, but rather as amusing trickery. The first creations were the property of eccentrics and fanatics. They claimed that just as it was possible to film something at rest, so it was possible to film motion by combining a series of single shots and then projecting them rapidly one after another. The idea seemed amusing at the time, and this is what the audience thought when they came to see the first film shows. The spectators were common people: the unemployed and the illiterate. This audience was not at all familiar with works of art, were not educated to appreciate art, and were preoccupied with the daily concerns of making a living. They simply wanted to be entertained, and the new amusing form of trickery served their needs. They thoroughly enjoyed the hocus-pocus of the films. The first films startled and marveled the viewers. They did not understand how it was possible for a train to travel on a stretched out cloth and how people were able to walk on that same cloth. Their understanding was that films were an illusion of reality that through a miracle were transferred onto the screen. It was as much a marvel to them as a magician's pulling rabbits and doves out of a hat.

Films at Present

Although films were not originally created to be an art form, they have become the principle form of art that we come in contact with in our daily lives. Films were not created as an art form -- to say that seems strange today, as millions of people are not interested in art of any kind except for movies and TV. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine how painting and sculpture, literature and music of today would appear if movies had not changed our concept of art so greatly. Artists of today paint, sculpt, write literature, stage theatrical productions, or create any other works under the influence of films, which make use of special perceptual senses.

From a Form of Magic to an Art Form

Technological advances and sophisticated equipment changed the film industry from an amusing form of magic to an art form. The new techniques were able to let the film industry overcome obstacles that constrained other forms of art, to such a degree that they saw in the film industry possibilities greater than those in any other art form. Every art form has its limits. If you are a painter, you cannot use words. If you are a sculptor, you can not expect the sculpture to dance. Painters have their paint and a canvas, which is a lot but also limiting. The gap between reality and art is always there because artistic means

are limited, while reality is infinite. The invention of movies was a challenging step towards closing the gap between art and life. Movie making is the art of all art forms. It contains everything: shape, color, movement, words, and music. It is no wonder that movies appear so complete, rich and full of opportunities, more than any other art form. Through the use of the movie camera, films can show wide-open spaces, and can realistically recreate the different scenes that people see walking along the streets, driving in their cars, etc. Unlike the human eye that sees everything from the same angle, movie makers can change the angle of filming and the distance of the camera. They can decide the amount of light and sharpness of focus. All of these can bring about amazing changes and reveal new scenes for the viewers.

Are movies an art form?

The fact that movies can create an illusion of reality better than any other art form brought up the question: are movies an art form? The issue facing the spectators at the turn of the century was: is it good that filmmaking has greater means for creating an illusion of reality? How can films be thought of as art if they are so similar to reality? If the filmmaker does not in any way process the pictures that are caught by the eye but just films the scenes -- then this is just a simple, mechanical craft, and for this you do not need any talent. The filmmakers' reply was that just like any other art form, movies have possibilities and boundaries of their own. The film industry can be similar to reality, more than any other field, but it can also depart from reality. Film in the hands of the filmmaker is like clay in the hands of sculpture. Photographer decide what to film, how to film, what to add, and what to delete. They can edit the film in a way that will create a new reality, that is not just a carbon copy of existing reality. They can create a reality that is worked, sophisticated, complex, pretty, and even more interesting than reality. Filmmakers, the pioneers of filmmaking, wanted to create films that would not just be a substitution for reality, but which would create an artistic experience.

Artistic Means for Movie Making

For filmmakers there are technical means whereby they can change reality. What can the filmmaker do to create films in the modern world, different from reality, deeper, and more interesting? One of the principle means of design that stand before the filmmaker is related to the special possibilities of the camera and its limits. The constraint of the camera is that its range of focus is more limited than that of the human eye. The camera can film just what fits within a given frame. This frame is rectangular and its measurements are standard. But this constraint can also be a great advantage. The filmmaker can decide which details from the enormous range of data will be included inside the frame and which will not. They decide upon a certain portion of reality and the one that is chosen is not accidental. The limited range of vision of the camera gives filmmakers the ability to focus the viewers' attention on certain pretty or meaningful details. They may have an event happen beyond the limits of the frame and may select the most important

event at that moment in order to heighten suspense. (For example, the filmmakers may decide not to let us see a love scene in a room but instead have us look at a view that the lovers see from the window.) Another advantage that the camera has unlike the human eye is that it can give different perspectives from different distances, different viewpoints, at with different intensity of lighting, at different degrees of focus, etc.

Another interesting aspect that without it, filmmaking would be a boring copy of reality, is editing. Editing a movie, i.e., cutting out parts of the film and reconnecting them elsewhere in a different order, this is where the most important difference is between the human eye and the perspective of the movie maker. The human vision is always continuous in time and space, and there are no "jumps": we see just what is in our field of vision. The view of the filmmaker is different. Using editing, the filmmaker can decide which scenes we will see and which we will not, and in which order. The possibility standing in front of the editor are different and manifold.

Scoring Key for "Movies: From a Form of Magic to an Art Form

1. Movies started as entertainment, a circus act, amusement.
2. The spectators that came to the movies were simple folks, from a low socioeconomic level, without an art background.
3. Movies today have turned into the principle art form, the art form of all art forms.
4. This art form modifies or influences all other art forms.
5. It includes the following components: shape, color, movement, words, and music.
6. Thanks to modern technology, the film industry as changed from simple amusement into an art form.
7. Through the artistic channels of movie making, i.e., choice of subject matter, focus, and editing, reality is fashioned into a new creative art form.
8. The contrast between the notion of early films as simple entertainment and current films as an art form.

PROBLEMS WITH NEW ISRAELI PROSE: BETWEEN ISOLATION AND INTEGRATION

by Benjamin Yitzhak Michaeli

In the new Hebrew prose originating in Israel, two markedly different trends emerged that were not simultaneous but appeared one after the other: separatism from literary heritage at the start, during its period of fermentation and propagation, and later on in its maturation, an effort to overcome this separatism, out of a recognition of the power of continuity. The nature of this new prose, whose first buds were seen during the struggle with an occupying power, and whose fruits ripened during the years of the State, is perceived retrospectively not as a foreign implant, whereby its winds brought its seed from a foreign land, but rather as a Hebrew "tree of creation" from whose roots it emerged and from whose juices it was saturated. Its buds, and probably its unripe fruit, emphasized its difference and individuality. Here comes its ripe fruit and indicates to us the similar and closeness, the fundamental unity

start in the Days of October or during the period of the struggle that led to it -- that is to say, a brief chronological affinity or a brief thematic affinity. Nevertheless, the conscious separatism, militant in nature and abominably cruel, was to no avail. Underneath the conscious stand, however, latent, irrational factors were operating, and at the first opportunity, these surfaced. Whatever the Revolution did not accomplish in bringing about ideological division along class lines within the Jewish collective, was brought about by the massive destruction that erased class distinctions and brought together all the different divisions of the Jewish people under the tyranny of the Nazis. A brotherly hand was extended to groups of Jews outside the country of the Revolution. According to Bergson, the ancient cry could be heard, as in his play, "I won't die for I will live!" Poets and storytellers who were formerly content to praise Stalin and events taking place in the Soviet Union, were reminded of their Jewish past and gave expression to their excitement in literature, revolving around ancient figures such as Rachel, King Solomon, Isaiah, the Maccabees, Bar Kochba, Rabbi Akiva, and Yehuda Halevy. Suddenly with the destruction of the Jews in the Holocaust, separatism vanished. There was a continual undercurrent of forces seeking a way of breaking through the man-made barriers. In other words, as long as it had not been accomplished through assimilation -- which takes many generations -- conscious separatism was eliminated by reality itself.

The second example: the "Canaanite" group. Certainly this group and the Yevreyskaya were not on one plane and did not aspire to the same goals. The latter group denied its heritage, seeking to eliminate any traces of identification with the Jewish people, and preserving what was merely subsidiary, the Yiddish language that was spoken by the Jewish community at large in the Soviet Union; whereas the former group adhered to its historic homeland declaring its desire to extend its borders, at the same time that it was planning to reduce the geographic borders of the Jewish nation. That is, their view was that Jews of the Diaspora were second-rate and should not have a stake in Eretz-Israel and in its people. Their use of historical roots produced a strange schism: the "Canaanites" acknowledged their historical homeland, but they denied the reality of the historical people, its generations, and its dispersion. Moreover, this inconsistency with regard to facts of Jewish history does not just concern the Diaspora, but also applies to the homeland as well. Not for naught were they drawn to the long lost period of their ancestry: before we became a people, before the Lord gave us the Torah and the Ten Commandments, before the appearance of the prophets, whereas the later period was perceived for all that primordial reminiscing as memories of the Molech, Baal, and Astarte. It was not that those ancient times were enlivened to ensure a foothold in later times, but that they, and they only, were considered to be the be-all and end-all of everything. In this way the "Canaanites" transformed the Israeli nation from an organic being, within which unity operates in spite of the multitude of changes, into a mechanical being, which is like clay in the potter's hands. But such a change is sure to be undone. Just as a living tree does not exist only as roots at the bottom and leaves at the top, but rather also as a trunk and the ever increasing network of branches, so too a change does not consist solely of a beginning and an end with a void between them.

But is not this Canaanitism but an anomalous phenomenon? Was it only an arbitrary occurrence? Whoever does not feel content with its public declarations but rather looks for a hidden motive will not rush to such a conclusion. When looking for traces of the Canaanites, one will find evidence of their predecessors and then will discover that the younger generation of authors was not that different, in fact, from the older. This did not imply departing for ancient regions, as did the authors of the Enlightenment Movement, but to a faithfulness to their intentions. Michal was fascinated by the love of Solomon and the wisdom of Ecclesiastes while perceiving what was tragic in the extinction of beauty and grandeur; Mappu envisioned an ancient period when the Jewish people were still rooted in their homeland, in contrast to their current detachment -- as an expression of their hope of restoration; Yalag employed the clashes between King Zedekiah and Jeremiah as a means of indicating his preference for statehood and the need for heeding the words of the prophets. What these authors had in common was a nostalgia for the period of independence of the people of Israel while prospering in their homeland and subordinated to the regime of the high priests, judges, and kings. Their followers differed in that they aimed for an earlier period -- that of the pagans, before these impulses were restrained and subjected to the Bible, the Ten Commandments, and public governmental structures. This was the case with Frishman in his "desert" tales (referring to the Book of Numbers) and Berdichevsky exploring the manifestations of the rule of blood and impulse; the same was true of Tchernichovsky in his psalms to Astarte, Baal, and Shneor in the hidden tablets (of the decalogue). Of course, there were differences among these later authors, but what they had in common was their fascination with the primitive, a fascination to account for their repulsion of the symptoms of decadence exhibited by the Jewish people oppressed in their exile. These authors were united by a wish to cure the Jewish people through reigniting their impulses that were suppressed, and transfusing healthy blood into its stricken body -- to bring life into the nation. Apparently, the major difference between them and the Canaanite sons was how they dealt with a change of circumstances for the Jewish people. The former were content in a nostalgic visionary form, matching the diasporic detachment in exile and the yearning to overcome it. The latter group, on the other hand, aspired for political-social concretization, that would match the reality of the homeland. Still wasn't there a hidden inclination for a reunion in the claim for separatism? Was it not a meritorious continuity achieved through a wrongful separation? That is to say, it was an intermittent continuity, whose advocates clung to an ancient and unknown stratum, because they believed that thence precisely would flow the healing serum of the nation that was to immunize it and help it to survive in times of change and crisis, as was taking place at the present time.

These two examples, extreme in their essence, illustrate the internal struggles among the literary groups. While for the first group separation had been a conscious act, latent trends toward continuity operated within the latter group, marking its Zionistic-pioneering nature. From the beginning this was a separation for the sake of continuity. This distancing themselves from the national heritage was not planned purposely, but was the result of major changes in the life of the Jewish

people -- of the descent of one way of life and cultural patterns on the one hand, and the rise of another on the other hand. In any case, the goal of continuity was latent during the period of uprootedness, and conscious separation, which the pioneering ancestors had bequeathed their sons, did not characterize the atrophic and spoiled patterns of existence in exile.

Scoring Key for "Problems with New Israeli Prose: Between Isolation and Integration"

1. There are two trends in modern Hebrew prose: first, separatism from the literary heritage and later on return to this heritage.
2. Separatism from the literary heritage was not created purposely and consciously but rather was a temporary and unavoidable result of ignorance of the heritage.
3. Despite attempts at separatism of modern Hebrew prose from its heritage, the younger generation started to recognize the value of the literary heritage and its spiritual richness.
4. The author gives two extreme examples of the separatism that lead ultimately to a coming to terms with this heritage.
5. First example: the Yevreyskaya in the Soviet Union.
6. Second example: the "Canaanite" group in Israel.
7. The concluding sentence concerning the trends of continuity within the separatism and/or the continuity as a need within separatism in new Israeli prose.

EFL Texts and Scoring Keys

HOW TO AVOID FOOLISH OPINIONS

by Bertrand Russell

To avoid the various foolish opinions to which mankind is prone, no superhuman genius is required. A few simple rules will keep you, not from all error, but from silly error.

If the matter is one that can be settled by observation, make the observation yourself. Aristotle could have avoided the mistake of thinking that women have fewer teeth than men, by the simple device of asking Mrs. Aristotle to keep her mouth open while he counted. He did not do so because he thought he knew. Thinking that you know when in fact you don't is a fatal mistake, to which we are all prone. I believe myself that hedgehogs eat black beetles, because I have been told that they do; but if I were writing a book on the habits of hedgehogs, I should not commit myself until I had seen one enjoying this unappetizing diet. Aristotle, however, was less cautious. Ancient and medieval authors know all about unicorns and salamanders; not one of them thought it necessary to avoid dogmatic statements about them because he had never seen one of them.

Many matters, however, are less easily brought to the test of experience. If, like most of mankind, you have passionate convictions of many such matters, there are ways in which you can make yourself aware of your own bias. If an opinion contrary to your own makes you angry, that is a sign that you are subconsciously aware of having no good reason for thinking as you

do. If someone maintains that two and two are five, or that Iceland is on the Equator, you feel pity rather than anger, unless you know so little of arithmetic or geography that his opinion shakes your own contrary conviction. The most savage controversies are those about matters as to which there is no good evidence either way. Persecution is used in theology, not in arithmetic, because in arithmetic there is knowledge, but in theology there is only opinion. So whenever you find yourself getting angry about a difference of opinion, be on your guard; you will probably find, on examination, that your belief is going beyond what the evidence warrants.

A good way of ridding yourself of certain kinds of dogmatism is to become aware of opinions held in social circles different from your own. When I was young, I lived much outside my own country -- in France, Germany, Italy, and the United States. I found this very profitable in diminishing the intensity of insular prejudice. If you cannot travel, seek out people with whom you disagree, and read a newspaper belonging to a party that is not yours. If the people and the newspaper seem mad, perverse, and wicked, remind yourself that you seem so to them. In this opinion both parties may be right, but they cannot both be wrong. This reflection should generate a certain caution.

For those who have enough psychological imagination, it is a good plan to imagine an argument with a person having a different bias. This has one advantage, and only one, as compared with actual conversation with opponents; this one advantage is that the method is not subject to the same limitations of time and space. Mahatma Gandhi deplored railways and steamboats and machinery; he would have liked to undo the whole of the industrial revolution. You may never have an opportunity of actually meeting anyone who holds this opinion, because in Western countries most people take the advantages of modern technique for granted. But if you want to make sure that you are right in agreeing with the prevailing opinion, you will find it a good plan to test the arguments that occur to you by considering what Gandhi might have said in refutation of them. I have sometimes been led actually to change my mind as a result of this kind of imaginary dialogue, and, short of this, I have frequently found myself growing less dogmatic and cocksure through realizing the possible reasonableness of a hypothetical opponent.

Be very wary of opinions that flatter your self-esteem. Both men and women, nine times out of ten, are firmly convinced of the superior excellence of their own sex. There is abundant evidence on both sides. If you are a woman, you can retort that so are most criminals. The question is inherently insoluble, but self-esteem conceals this from most people. We are all, whatever part of the world we come from, persuaded that our own nation is superior to all others. Seeing that each nation has its characteristic merits possessed by our nation are the really important ones, while its demerits are comparatively trivial. Here, again, the rational man will admit that the question is one to which there is no demonstrably right answer. It is more difficult to deal with the self-esteem of man as man, because we cannot argue out the matter with some non-human mind. The only way I know of dealing with this general human conceit is to remind ourselves that man is a brief episode in the life of a small planet in a little corner of the universe, and that for aught we know, other parts of the cosmos may contain beings as superior to ourselves as we are to jelly-fish.

Scoring Key for "How to Avoid Foolish Opinions"

1. The article suggests procedures for avoiding foolish opinions.
2. First, observe things for yourself whenever possible.
3. Second, if observation is out, discover any biases you may have about an issue./because belief might go beyond evidence.
4. Rid yourself of prejudice by discovering the opinions held by others -- whether through meeting people out of your social group, travel, or through the newspaper.
5. Another means is to have an imaginary argument with an hypothetical opponent.
6. Finally, be wary of taking a position which makes you right at the expense of the opposite sex or another nation since it is a no-win situation./Be wary of opinions that flatter your self-esteem.

Linking: intro that procedures/rules for avoiding foolish opinions/dogmatism.

MODERN CONSTITUTIONS

by K.C. Whears

Most countries make the Constitution superior to the ordinary law.

If we investigate the origins of modern Constitutions, we find that, practically without exception, they were drawn up and adopted because people wished to make a fresh start, so far as the statement of their system of government was concerned. The desire or need for a fresh start arose either because, as in the United States, some neighboring communities wished to unite together under a new government, or because, as in Austria and Hungary or Czechoslovakia after 1918, communities had been released from an Empire as the result of a war and were now free to govern themselves; or because a revolution had made a break with the past and a new form of government on new principles was desired; or because defeat in war had broken the continuity of government and a fresh start was needed after the war. The circumstances in which a break with the past and the need for a fresh start caome about vary from country to country, but in almost every case in modern times, counties have a Constitution for the very simple and elementary reason that they wanted, for some reason, to begin again and so they put down in writing the main outline, at least, of their proposed system of government. This has been the practice certainly since 1781 when the American Constitution was drafted, and as the years passed, no doubt imitation and the force of example have led all countries to think it necessary to have a Constitution.

This does not explain, however, why many countries think it necessary to give the Constitution a higher status in law than other rules of law. The short explanation of this phenonmenon is that in many countries a Constitution is thought of as an instrument by which government can be controlled. Constitutions spring from a belief in limited government. Countries differ, however, in the extent to which they wish to impose limitations. Sometimes the Constitution limits the legislature also, but only so far as amendment of the Constitution itself is concerned; and sometimes it imposes restrictions upon the legislature which go

far beyond this point and forbid it to make laws upon certain subjects or in a certain way or with certain effects. Whatever the nature and the extent of the restrictions, however, they are based on a common belief in limited government and in the use of a constitution to impose these limitations.

The nature of the limitations to be imposed on a government, and therefore the degree to which a Constitution will be supreme over a government, depends upon the objects which the framers of the Constitution wish to safeguard. In the first place they may want to do no more than ensure that the Constitution is not altered casually or carelessly or by subterfuge or by implication; they may want to secrue that this important document is not lightly tampered with, but solemnly, with due notice and deliberation, consciously amended. In that case it is legitimate to require some special process of constitutional amendment -- say, that the legislature may amend the Constitution only by a two-thirds majority or after a general election or perhaps upon three months notice.

The framers of Constitutions have more than this in mind. They may feel that a certain kind of relationship between legistlators and the executive is important, or that the judicatures should have a certain guaranteed degree of independence of the legislature and executive. They may feel that there are certain rights which citizens have and which the legislature or the executive must not invade or remove. They may feel that certain laws should not be made at all. The framers of the American Constitution, for example, forbade Congress to pass an ex-post facto law, that is, a law made after the occurence of the action or the situation which it seeks to regulate -- a type of law which may render a man guilty of an offence through an action which, when he committed it, was innocent. The framers of the Irish Constitution of 1937 forbade the legislature to pass any law permitting divorce.

Further safeguards may be called for when distinct and different communities decide to join together under a common government but are anxious to retain certain rights for themselves. If these communities differ in language, race, and religion, safeguards may be needed to guarantee to them a free exercise of these national characteristics. Those who framed the Swiss, the Canadian, and the South African Constitutions, to name a few only, had to consider these questions. Even when communities do not differ in language, race, or religion, they may still be unwilling to unite unless they are guaranteed a ameasure of independence inside the union. To meet this demand the Constituion must not only divide powers between the government of the Union and the governments of the individual component parts, but it must also be supreme in so far at any rate as it enshrines and safeguards this division of powers.

In some countries only one of the considerations mentioned above may operate; in others some, and in some, all. Thus, in the Irish Constitution, the framers were anxious that amendment should be a deliberate process, that the rights of citizens should be safeguarded, and that certain types of laws should not be passed at all, and therefore, they made the Constitution supreme and imposed restrictions upon the legislature to achieve these ends. The framers of the American Constitution also had these objects in mind, but on top of that they had to provide for the desire of the thirteen colonies to be united for some purposes only and to remain independent for others. This was an

additional reason for giving supremacy to the Constitution and for introducting certain extra safeguards into it.

Scoring Key for "Modern Consitutions"

1. The text first gives the historical reason for constitutions -- namely, that people wanted to have a fresh start at their system of government.
2. Usually the constitution was put above other laws that the legislature or executive might wish to instate./supremacy of Constitution to control government.
3. This power was granted the constitution to guard against efforts to tamper with the constitutional process.
4. Thus, constitutions often include rights (of citizens) which cannot be invaded or removed by the government./to limit the legislature as to amendment of the Constitution./to limit the powers of government.
5. There may also be stipulations protecting the rights of special communities governed by the same constitution. [constituent states/colonies in the case of the US]
6. It is noted that countries differ as to the number of special checks and balances stipulated by their constitution.

Linking: Opening topic sentence about Constitution serving as fresh start./Degree to which the Constitution limits government depends on...

SPECIALIZATION

by Ortega y Gasset

Specialization commences precisely at a period which gives civilized man the title "encyclopedic." The intellectual history of the nineteenth century starts on its course under the direction of beings who live "encyclopedically," though their production already has some tinge of specialism. In the following generation, the balance is upset and specialism begins to dislodge culture from the individual scientist. When, by 1890, a third generation assumes intellectual command in Europe we meet with a type of scientist unparalleled in history. He is one who, out of all that has to be known in order to be a man of judgement, is only acquainted with one science -- and, even of that one, he only knows the small corner in which he is an active investigator. He even proclaims it as a virture that he takes no cognisance of what lies outside the narrow territory specially cultivated by himself and gives the name of "dilettantism" to any curiosity for the general scheme of knowledge.

What happens is that, enclosed within the narrow limits of his visual field, he does actually succeed in discovering new facts and in advancing the progress of the science which he hardly knows -- and, incidentally, the encyclopedia of thought of which he is conscientiously ignorant. How has such a thing been possible, how is it still possible? For it is necessary to insist upon this extraordinary but undeniable fact: experimental science has progressed thanks in great part to the work of men astoundingly mediocre and even less than mediocre. That is to say, modern science, the root and symbol of our actual civilization, finds a place for the intellectually commonplace

man and allows his to work therein with success. The reason for this lies in what is at the same time the great advantage and the gravest peril of the new science, and of the civilization directed and represented by it, namely, mechanization. A fair amount of the things that have to be done in physics or in biology is mechanical work of the mind which can be done by anyone, or almost anyone. For the purpose of innumerable investigations it is possible to divide science into small sections, to enclose oneself in one of these, and to leave out of consideration all the rest. The solidity and exactitude of the methods allow for this temporary but quite real dismemberment of knowledge. The work is done under one of these methods as with a machine and, in order to obtain quite abundant results, it is not even necessary to have rigorous notions of their meaning and foundations. In this way the majority of scientists help the general advance of science while shut up in the narrow cell of their laboratory, like the bee in the cell of the hive.

But this creates an extraordinarily strange type of man. The investigator who has discovered a new fact of nature must necessarily experience a feeling of power and self assurance. With a certain apparent justice, he will look upon himself as "a man who knows." And, in fact, there is in him a portion of something which, added to many other portions not existing in him, does really constitute knowledge. This is the true inner nature of the specialist who, in the first years of this century, has reached the wildest stage of exaggeration. The specialist "knows" very well his own, tiny corner of the universe; he is radically ignorant of all the rest.

Here we have a precise example of this strange new man, whom I have attempted to define, from both of these two opposite aspects. I have said that he was a human product unparalleled in history. The specialist serves as a striking, concrete example of the species, making clear to us that radical nature of the novelty. For, previously, a man could be divided simply into the learned and the ignorant -- those who fit the former category and those that fit the latter. But our specialist cannot be brought in under either of these two categories. He is not lerned, for he is formally ignorant of all that does not enter into his specialty; but neither is he ignorant, because he is "a scientist," and "knows" very well his own tiny portino of the universe. We shall have to say that he is a learned ignoramus -- which is a very serious matter, as it implies that he is a person who is ignorant, not in the fashion of the ignorant may, but with all the petulance of one who is learned in his own special line.

Scoring Key for "Specialization"

1. By the end of the nineteenth century the intellectual generalists had given way to specialists, people versed only in one science rather than having a broad knowledge base. (during the 19th C.) [not necessarily contrasting with intellectual generalists]
2. While these scientists have made progress in their fields, they remain ignorant of the rest of the world.
3. Even in their fields, mechanization has allowed them to do successful work on the basis of a minimum of knowledge.
4. The author sees the situation to be producing strange new people: specialists who are not learned, yet are not ignorant in that they are scientists, hence "learned ignoramuses."